

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Official Action objected to the drawings for not showing every feature recited in the claims.

Responsively, the claims have been amended such that the drawings reflect each feature recited. Accordingly, withdrawal of the drawing objection is solicited.

The Official Action rejected claims 14 and 16 under §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Official Action stated that the claims contained subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of skill in the art to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the arrangement of the doors in claim 15 and the arrangement described in claim 16 were said not to be clear.

Responsively, the claims have been amended to remedy the stated basis of rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the enablement rejection is solicited.

Claim 15 was rejected under §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The claim was amended to provide antecedent basis for the recited "two articulated parts".

Claim 20 was rejected under §101, for failing to set forth any steps in a process.

Responsively, the claim has been amended to remedy the stated basis of rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the \$101 rejection is solicited.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected as obvious over KOSSA et al. 3,934,530.

Claim 17 has been rejected as obvious over KOSSA in view of CUSHING et al. 3,823,681.

Claim 18 has been rejected as obvious over KOSSA in view of NI 5,988,093.

Claim 19 has been rejected as obvious over KOSSA in view of BURNETT 3,133,518.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to include the recitations of claim 18. Claim 18 has been cancelled. Accordingly, independent claim 11 now requires the structural feature that the basin is configured to be closed to limit to said basin the pollution by a vessel in distress protected in the basin.

In this regard, KOSSA discloses a vessel which has a basin which cannot be closed to avoid polluting fluids to pass. The door of KOSSA cannot be sealed, and many passages connect the "basin" to the sea. Moreover, KOSSA discloses a vessel which cannot maneuver by applying a transverse thrust.

The rejection of claim 18 acknowledged that KOSSA did not make these teachings. For these missing teachings, NI was offered. The Official Action states that "NI discloses a vessel

similar to that of KOSSA and teaches providing the same with transverse thrusters". Note that NI discloses a floating dock with a U-shape which cannot be closed at two ends. Accordingly, NI does not disclose a basin.

Accordingly, neither KOSSA nor NI discloses a basin which can be closed to avoid polluting fluids to pass between the basin and the sea. This is an important feature required for a rescue vessel to prevent the vessel in distress from sinking or becoming a delayed-action bomb. In view of this, one skilled in the art, having the benefit of both KOSSA and NI, would not obtain a rescue vessel having a basin which can be closed and avoid polluting fluids to pass between the vessel and the sea. Thus, the features of the invention as recited by amended claim 11 are non-obvious over the prior art.

Concerning claim 17, CUSHING discloses a vessel with a "basin" which cannot be closed because it has no rear door. So, one of skill in the art, in view of KOSSA and CUSHING, would not obtain a rescue vessel having a basin which can be closed.

As to the rejection of claim 19, BURNETT discloses a dry dock which can define a closed basin. However, BURNETT does not disclose maneuvering means that are intended to exert a thrust in a direction that is transverse to the longitudinal axis of the vessel.

Accordingly, the combination of KOSSA and BURNETT does not result in a process in which a maneuvering step allows "to

exert a thrust in a direction that is transverse to at least the longitudinal axis of the vessel, to orient the vessel such that its rear part that is opened wide is rotated toward the vessel in distress". Thus, this claim is also non-obvious.

From the above, applicant believes that the claims have been amended to be proper as to form and so as to recite the invention in a non-obvious manner. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.


Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

Should a telephone interview be beneficial, it is requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the same.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

REL/lk